

<i>Interview Summary</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/091,360	TSIPOURAS ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	LORI A. CLOW	1631

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Lori A. Clow (PTO). (3) Triantafylllos Tafas (App.).
 (2) Steve Moore (Apps. Rep.). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 June 2009.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: Brief overview of current products.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ravkin, Tisone, Rutenberg and Atwood.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the difference between the prior art and the instant claims. Particularly discussed the automatic location of a cell candidate implementing the steps recited in the instant claims, which are not taught in the prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Lori A. Clow/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1631	
---	--